



---

PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

---

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

# Brooker Highway – Elwick Road to Howard Road

---

*Brought up by Mr Brooks and ordered by the House of Assembly to be printed.*

---

## MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Legislative Council

Mr Farrell  
Mrs Taylor

House of Assembly

Mr Brooks (Chairman)  
Ms Ogilvie  
Mrs Rylah

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	2
2	BACKGROUND .....	2
3	PROJECT COSTS.....	3
4	EVIDENCE .....	3
5	DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE.....	13
6	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION .....	13

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Committee has the honour to report to the House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914* on the -

### **Brooker Highway, Elwick Road to Howard Road**

## 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This reference recommended the Committee approve the upgrade of the Brooker Highway between Howard Road Roundabout and Elwick Road including the intersection with Goodwood Road, to deliver greater efficiency and travel time reliability on the highway, particularly in the direction of peak traffic flows.
- 2.2 This project covers a section of the highway which is currently subject to heavy congestion and travel delays at peak times, and traffic modelling suggests that this situation will only worsen in the future.
- 2.3 Congestion and travel delays are exacerbated due to the short distance and lack of queuing space between intersections, particularly the Brooker Highway junction with Elwick Road. Optimal traffic flow on the highway, through the use of synchronised traffic signals, is hampered by the roundabout at the Howard Road intersection. The operation of the roundabout results in regular queuing along the highway, and a subsequent high crash incidence due to the stop-start conditions that are created.
- 2.4 Furthermore, general growth in Hobart's northern suburbs, and specific high-traffic generating developments in the immediate vicinity of the subject intersections, is placing increasing pressure on the operation of the existing infrastructure. The situation is also placing pressure on accessing the industrial precincts and residential areas adjacent to the Highway.
- 2.5 The proposed works will include:
  - Replacement of the Howard Road roundabout with a new signalised intersection;
  - Realignment of Elwick Road and Goodwood Road to form one signalised intersection;
  - Installation of a new access to Timsbury Road from Howard Road.
  - Coordination of the signals at both intersections for maximum traffic flow efficiency, especially at peak travel times;
  - Three through-lanes in each direction;
  - On-road advanced bicycle storage boxes;
  - Installation of signalised pedestrian crossings at all intersections; and

- A shared pathway for pedestrians and cyclists along the northern side of the highway.
- 2.6 The project will improve the efficiency of the Brooker Highway as a key strategic and freight corridor between Hobart and the rest of Tasmania, by targeting the key bottleneck on the Brooker Highway caused by the close proximity of three junctions; Elwick Road, Goodwood Main Road and Howard Road. The proposed works will result in an improvement in travel times, both for movements along the Brooker Highway, and for turns onto and off the highway, and improved safety outcomes.
- 2.7 The full submission of the Department of State Growth in support of this reference can be found on website of the Committee at:-

<http://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/ctee/Joint/works.htm>

### 3 PROJECT COSTS

- 3.1 Pursuant to the Message from Her Excellency the Governor-in-Council, the estimated cost of the project is \$32 million.
- 3.2 The following table shows the P50 and P90 cost estimates for the project:

Project Element	Preliminary Cost Estimate	
	\$ M	
Client costs excluding Property Acquisition	2.74	
Construction and Property Acquisition	24.04	
Contingencies	P50	P90
	0.99	4.65
<b>Subtotal Project Estimate</b>	<b>27.78</b>	<b>31.43</b>
Escalation	0.48	0.55
<b>Total Project Outturn Cost, to nearest \$0.1 M</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>31.9</b>

### 4 EVIDENCE

- 4.1 The Committee commenced its inquiry on Monday, 11 May last with an inspection of the site of the proposed works. The Committee then returned to Parliament House, Hobart whereupon the following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:-

- Adrian Paine, Manager Network Planning, Transport Infrastructure Services, Department of State Growth; and
- Vanessa King, Project Manager, Transport Infrastructure Services, Department of State Growth.

## **Background**

- 4.2 Mr Paine and Ms King provided the following background to the proposed works:

**Mr PAINE** - *The staggered T intersection, as we refer to it, that connects Elwick Road with Goodwood Road and the Howard Road roundabout was identified some time ago as being one of the most significant bottlenecks on the Brooker Highway. The most recent proposals in 2007 and 2008 were put on the table and got to the point of nearly being constructed. It virtually went up for development application to the council but the funding was then pulled and reallocated elsewhere. Since then, in 2012, we made a submission to the Commonwealth Government to seek some funding. It was initially promised by the then Commonwealth government, and the new Liberal government that was elected not long after then committed to funding for the project to proceed. It is on that basis that we have pursued this design and have it here before you.*

**Ms KING** - *The intent of the project is travel time improvements. There are some safety benefits but the main focus is travel time improvements, with the resulting economic benefits that come for the community.*

## **Project Design**

- 4.3 The Committee questioned the witnesses on how the project design had been determined, and the following exchange took place:

**Mr PAINE** - *The report investigates through to the next 20 years, in terms of traffic tolerance and shows an overall improvement over that period. That is what we call short to medium term, 20 years. If you want to go beyond that you would probably be looking at a grade separated interchange here and that would be significantly more expensive.*

*That is why we are saying it is a short to medium term solution and not an ultimate long term solution. However the benefits of a grade separating change here in the overall Brooker Highway functionality would be limited because you have still got major intersections at Derwent Park and then again at Risdon Road which you would also need to deal with in the same project.*

**Ms RYLAH** - *Otherwise you are going to create a bottleneck.*

**Mr PAINE** - *Exactly, you are just getting the traffic quicker to Derwent Park or Risdon roads where the bottleneck is going to remain if you do not do grade separated there as well.*

**Ms KING** - *....Part of the reason was that when we looked at grade separated quite significantly that cost came up in the order of \$50 000 000. We are looking at lowering the Brooker by eight to nine metres, which is quite significant. It would be a fun construction management exercise too. Also providing appropriate ramps in an urban environment is difficult.*

**Mr PAINE** - We need to have a minimum clearance of at least six metres to allow for the heavy vehicles to travel underneath.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It would change the landscape significantly, wouldn't it?

**Mr PAINE** - Yes, it would.

**Ms KING** - Our work indicated that grade separated is not viable at this stage.

**Mr PAINE** - There would need to be significantly greater acquisition both at the racecourse and the showground to make room for all those ramps. The impact in the local community would be substantial.

**Mrs RYLAH** - Is the 20-year time horizon normal? Is that acceptable for highways in the state?

**Mr PAINE** - That is a reasonable time horizon and we generally apply some cost benefit analysis to indicate the benefits we achieve over that 20 years is justified by the expenditure. It is not uncommon to do some upgrades and in 15 to 20 years come back and do more because the traffic volumes have lifted to a point where you can justify spending more money.

### **Project Benefits**

- 4.4 The Committee questioned the witnesses on the benefits of the project. Ms King indicated that there would be significant economic benefits resulting from the project:

*...The cost benefit analysis that was undertaken indicated travel time savings over a 34-year period was \$94 million and \$47 million in vehicle operating savings. That is \$140 million benefit for a \$30 million expenditure.*

- 4.5 The Committee also questioned the witnesses on the estimated savings in travel times for motorists. Ms King noted that:

*...It is waited average of two minutes. It may not sound massive for each person but if you're waiting at the lights it seems like a very long time.*

- 4.6 Mr Paine added that:

*...When you have a road like this, carrying 35 000 to 40 000 vehicles a day, that adds up to a lot of money.*

### **Pedestrian Access to Goodwood Primary School**

- 4.7 The Committee noted some serious concerns with access to Goodwood Primary School from the Goodwood community via the current overpass across the Brooker Highway. The Committee's concerns related not only to the ability to safely access the school, but also that the current overpass heightened Goodwood residents' sense of disconnection from their school. The Committee raised these concerns with the witnesses who

noted that the conversion of the Howard Road roundabout to a signalised intersection would provide a safer and more accessible highway crossing point for Goodwood residents with mobility issues, those using prams, the elderly and cyclists:

**Ms OGILVIE** - ...What I would like to say, though, and this may be a personal reflection, is that the issue of overpass is one that I hold as a very deep concern. I recognise the work that we looked at this morning around the pedestrian crossings, but the overpass to Goodwood, which has really kept that suburb a little bit separate from its own school, to me is a critical piece of the picture. My constituents in Goodwood would not like it if they did not think I was raising it as a high priority.

The overpass that is there at the moment has steps, and anybody who is not fully able, with a pram or wheelchair or elderly and those sorts of things, has difficulty with that. I throw that at you to give you an opportunity to respond in the way you did this morning with the solutions that you sought to implement so that I can better understand how your solution will fix that challenge.

**Ms KING** - We are talking about the pedestrian overpass?

**Ms OGILVIE** - Yes, in particular the one between Goodwood and the school.

**Ms KING** - Part of the design of the works at both intersections, but perhaps particularly at the Howard Road, Renfrew Circle intersection is the one that is most relevant for the school. It is the closest to the school. That is currently a roundabout at the moment and that is quite difficult to navigate on foot, particularly if your mobility is not great.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I see kids running across there and it looks quite dangerous.

**Ms KING** - That intersection will no longer be a roundabout. It will be a fully signalised intersection with pedestrian lights and with cycle access, improved cycle facilities through that intersection. That gives a much safer crossing opportunity in the vicinity of the school because it is a controlled and managed one. The pre-schoolers always have the great delight of pressing the button to call the lights.

**Ms OGILVIE** - What sort of distance is there between the current overpass, if you were to walk from that up to the lights and back down on the other side of the road.

**Ms KING** - It is about 300 metres up to the lights, across the road and then 300 metres back to the school.

- 4.8 The Committee questioned the witnesses as to why upgrading the current overpass to make it more accessible was not considered as part of the proposed works. Ms King noted that such an upgrade was considered, but did not provide any significant benefits for pedestrians:

We looked at an all-access overpass and one of the findings was that the travel times are not actually significantly better for pedestrians. You might think it would be better to go over the road, by the time you get up and down again, it actually is not significantly different to walking up to the lights and back again. The ramps have to be very long to get the safe grades. It is quite a considerable piece of

structure, which our assessment indicated did not provide significant benefit to the community.

- 4.9 The Committee sought further clarification from the witnesses on the safety aspects of both an upgraded overpass and the planned pedestrian crossing at the Howard Road signalised intersection, and the following exchange took place:

**CHAIR** - The overpass solution or option that was considered by the Government - and we have heard some evidence on that already - do you feel the option that you have there now is warranted, or should it be reconsidered at a later point for the pedestrian solution?.....Are you confident the solution that is presented to this committee will achieve appropriate safety for pedestrians, or would it be preferable to look at an overpass?

**Mr PAINE** - The solution we have presented will provide adequate safety for pedestrians. The only question is, as you have rightly raised, because of the separation people may choose not to use it. That is obviously not something we have direct control over. As we have said, it is a significant improvement over the roundabout at the moment, which does not provide any safe opportunity for pedestrians to cross.

**Ms OGILVIE** - I appreciate how you are making your decisions based on budget and scope and all of those things and looking to the future. If it weren't a budgetary consideration, and I notice how much contingency you have in your budget, would you say that a better solution would be to also have a pedestrian overpass to the school?

**Mr PAINE** - ... .. You could always do something better, as we could with the road, and go to a fully grade-separated interchange we were just talking about, if we had another \$20 million-odd.

**Ms OGILVIE** - It is a matter of prioritising. Is that what we are talking about?

**Mr PAINE** - It is a matter of priorities. It is also being done in significant consultation with the community and the council. Councils obviously have the ultimate responsibility of, say, in providing pedestrian and cycling facilities. We have had significant discussions with council and proposed this solution and put our case forward for not including a new elaborate overpass. We have generally found that has been accepted by the community. As you say, if you had more money, then, yes, we could look certainly at putting up –

**CHAIR** - Following on from that, it goes to consultation. Did the council raise that, or they didn't give a preference to what they would like?

**Mr PAINE** - No, they did not give us any particular indication. They just wanted to make sure that we had investigated and consulted with the community over this issue.

... .. Our primary focus is definitely on the road network. That is what our funding is for, and that is where we start. If we can provide other facilities - better facilities for pedestrians and riders - that is great and we will aim to do that. But we are conscious of diverting funding that we should be applying to the road, to provide pedestrian facilities.



## Consultation

- 4.10 The Committee noted from the Department's submission that extensive consultation had been undertaken, with consultation well-received by affected stakeholders. Under questioning, the witnesses provided further information on the consultation process:

**Ms KING** - ..... We have a stakeholder management plan that early on identified all the key stakeholders. We have undertaken different forms of consultation with different groups tailored to those specific groups - from the point of view of the local residents as opposed to business or bigger organisations. There have been a couple of public information sessions, the most recent of which was in February at the shopping centre. The dominant feedback was 'get on with it', so we are trying very hard to do that. Some residents who are adjoining the project have specific concerns with their home about impact either during construction or in the longer term. We have worked with those residents to attempt to ameliorate those impacts. Examples include replacement of fencing with a higher fence.

We are working with council on landscaping where that is perceived as a benefit for residents, needing always to balance with landscaping. We need to make sure we maintain sight lines along the road. It's not acceptable for the landscaping to introduce a safety risk, but accepting residents are looking for screening. We believe our work with those residents has been effective, that they understand the project and are accepting of it. It is always going to be difficult if you live very close to a highway.

**Ms KING** - ... .. Everybody is very supportive.

**Mr PAINE** - Yes, they are and have been. As you have seen with our documentation, we have had extensive consultation with the council, amongst others. We have tried to address everyone's concerns as we have gone along the way and not waited until we lodged the DA -

**Ms KING** - And then worked out what the problems are.

**Mr PAINE** - Exactly. It is part of the reason for our consultation process.

**Ms KING** - That consultation engagement continues. We have a lot of work planned out about how to do the construction advice and information because that is going to be important to road users, about when we are coming and what we are doing and what the impacts will be. Another example of ongoing engagement is with Elwick Racecourse during their master planning. There is a working group with them and their consultants and we have a representative of the department, which is me, on that working group so we stay engaged with Elwick and understand what they are proposing to do on their site and how that interacts with both the project and the long-term use of Goodwood Road, which is a State Growth road and a limited access road.

## Land Acquisition

- 4.11 The Committee questioned the witnesses on the land that the Department needed to acquire for the proposed works. The Committee was specifically interested in the impacts on Housing Tasmania tenants, and

sought some comfort from the witnesses that no public housing was to be acquired and demolished:

**Ms KING** - *The Housing Tasmania acquisition is quite small. There is a section on the corner of Renfrew Circle, a tiny piece of land and -*

**CHAIR** - *You are not going to bulldoze someone's house?*

**Ms KING** - *Correct. We are not even moving the fence because that fence is not on the property boundary. The apparent impact on that property is nothing. There is legal impact because we are taking a piece of land, but it is piece of land that, when you look at the property, does not appear to belong to the property at the moment. The day-to-day impact is negligible.*

**CHAIR** - *We are not going to have a resident or tenant from a Housing Tasmania home distraught or impacted in there with their life?*

**Ms KING** - *We are not bulldozing a public housing house.*

### **Traffic Management During Construction**

4.12 The Committee questioned the witnesses on how traffic would be managed during the construction period. Ms King noted that the contract documents would be designed to ensure a minimum level of service, as well as completing as much of the works as possible off-network, in order to minimise disruptions to the travelling public:

*We have worked up a staging plan with the Department of State Growth using our internal significant expertise and the expertise of the consultants to work up a seven stage plan. We believe it is possible that contractors will have alternative ways of looking at the staging and their alternatives may be better for project outcomes. We are putting our staging into the contract documents. We are proposing at this stage to allow alternative staging by the contractors that we will assess.*

*.....We are putting in place mechanisms through the tendering and contract process to make sure that we can balance making the construction duration shorter, because that is better for everybody. However, we still need to keep the road functioning during construction and they are two real trade-offs. If you optimise one you potentially lose out significantly on the other. We believe we have a solution that works but we do not want to prevent bright ideas coming through from the contractors which may improve the project.*

*We are proceeding with contract documents that say there must be two lanes sealed in both directions at all times. We may have to drop down for occasional night works. At the moment night works are not planned but there will be some occasions where we will have to do things at night when very few people are using the road. There will be occasions when we will have to do change overs and we may look at one lane each way. We are putting those requirements of two lanes each way and we are also putting in requirements about pedestrian access. We are not forgetting about pedestrians during construction because that is very important to maintain that.*

We must have appropriate lighting because the lighting of the road will change over the project. You must not only have an opportunity to cross but you can see where you are walking when you cross. They are the sorts of things that we are working through internally to try and manage the construction. It will be a bit messy but it is for a long term benefit.

By about stage 2 in the construction period we have this consolidated intersection at Elwick and Goodwood roads, so that what was two junctions becomes one, fairly early in the project - not the very earliest, but fairly early. That provides benefits quite early that counteract having the smaller number of lanes. Obviously you won't get the full benefit of the project until everything is open, but fairly early on, by consolidating those two intersections into one you start to get some benefits which counteract that.

... ..The other thing is that during construction we have to have construction speeds. Along here it will not be an 80 kph zone during construction. That will impact the flows, but at least everybody is moving at a uniform pace. It must be safe for the workers, so we have to have those construction speed limits.

... ..The works start around Elwick Racecourse. We do as much work off-network as possible so we get as much construction done as possible that the public are driving past, not driving through. Get as much done as possible and then start bringing people onto new roads. We work our way towards Howard Road.

### **Impact on Pedestrian Access to the Royal Hobart Show**

- 4.13 The Committee noted that Royal Hobart Show generated a significant amount of traffic, both pedestrian and vehicle traffic. The Committee questioned the witnesses on how this situation would be managed during construction and the following exchange took place:

**CHAIR** - We have all, no doubt, been to the Hobart Show. There is an extraordinary amount of pedestrian access for those three days. I know we are not going to change the construction or put in a special show gate, but do you think that will improve?

**Ms KING** - We are putting special conditions into the construction contract. One of those is for this year, 2015. We will not allow the contractors access to the site before the show. We are hoping to have the contract ready and signed and to be working through construction and traffic management plans in the lead-up to the show, but no physical works before this year's show.

In the following year, 2016, we are intending to write in the contract that the contractor must not work during show week because our expectation and understanding is that there is a lot of movement in the lead-up to the show because all the exhibitors are moving onto site and there is a lot of additional equipment getting moved in around the vicinity. Then you have all the public access during the days of the show. Our view was that it would be appropriate for us to say to our contractors for that week to be off-site. Catch up with the paperwork, whatever they need to do, but do not be onsite during that week. We thought that was an appropriate management activity. Also, the same for the weekend of the Hobart Cup.

4.14 The Committee also questioned the witnesses about pedestrian access post-construction and whether the proposed works would provide for improved pedestrian safety:

**CHAIR** - My question was more about redesigning pedestrian access at those traffic lights. Is there a significant change to what is already there? I know we are taking one set of lights out and moving it, but the largest amount of pedestrian access is at that intersection and will this, as a minimum, provide the equal level of safety there? I presume it would enhance it.

**Ms KING** - One of the changes we are making is that the islands are larger, so that you can wait and group people in a larger, safer environment as they are making those crossings, particularly for those people who might take a bit longer to cross they road. They have got a larger place to wait for those people. It takes a little bit more time to get across. They have a better refuge.

**Mr PAINE** - Currently the special traffic management in place during show days anyway reduces speeds through the area and the like, to accommodate the extra pedestrian movements and increase the safety. I imagine that scenario will have to continue because you still have a lot of people moving on foot across the intersection.

**Mrs RYLAH** - I see that these islands are quite large, but this one here I would have thought would be a primary one that is used. How wide is that? Does that allow for prams and families and all that sort of stuff?

**Mr PAINE** - It is also long, so we have off-set the crossing so that people come across and then have to walk sideways, so the length of it creates quite a big storage room for pedestrians. It is not just they haven't got the width that is available; they also have a significant amount of length.

**Ms KING** - It is about really specifically providing extra places for people to wait.

**Mrs RYLAH** - The width is wide enough to accommodate a family pushing a pram and all that sort of thing.

**Mr PAINE** - Yes.

### **Impact on Elwick Racecourse**

4.15 The Committee noted that the Elwick Racecourse would be impacted by the proposed works, with land to be acquired from Tasracing. The Committee questioned the witnesses about the impacts on the Elwick Racecourse and how the Department was planning to ameliorate those impacts:

**Ms KING** - The racecourse is the site for the largest acquisition. It's not a particularly large acquisition as a proportion of the racecourse site. The acquisition is shown in the appendices. It is a wedge along the Brooker and a wedge along Goodwood Road - two legs of acquisition. It is land that is currently grassed with a few trees and used for parking at peak events for the racecourse.... We are putting in some additional parking and paved parking adjoining the entrance. Considerably further up on the corner of the racecourse we are putting in some gravel parking.

**CHAIR** - ..... So that's made the racing club significantly happier or more open to the changes?

**Mr PAINE** - Yes.

**Ms KING** - We're required to ameliorate the impacts. If we remove parking we are required to provide a solution, and that is a solution we have worked through with TRC. We have been working with them for many months in developing their understanding of the impact on their property.

**Mrs RYLAH** - Do we have to re-fence their area for them?

**Ms KING** - Yes, we will re-fence along there.

**Mrs RYLAH** - And that will be good security fencing?

**Ms KING** - That's right. We have been in consultation with the TRC on that fencing and the fencing we've proposed is to their requirements.

**Mr PAINE** - They also have a concern about traffic headlights interfering with the racecourse. We have talked about making sure the fence is at an appropriate height to shelter the horses and the racecourse from the stray headlights.

**Mrs RYLAH** - And that's in our costing?

**Ms KING** - That's all part of the project.

**Mr PAINE** - As well as some works we are doing on their stables.

**Ms KING** - We've got an allowance. The TRC is commencing a master planning exercise for their review of the long-term functionality of its site. As part of the compensation for acquisition there may be some stable relocations as part of State Growth's contribution.

**Mr PAINE** - By providing car parking at the other end of their facility, at the eastern side, we need to create a pedestrian link back through to the main stadium, which goes through their stabling area. Some works will be required there that is part of our impost on the racecourse to allow for that safe pedestrian passage, which will include some modification of their stables.

**Ms KING** - ..... They're trying to think about a way of pedestrians passing the stables in a way that adds to the amenity without detracting from safety. People like seeing the horses and it's interesting to see behind the scenes but they need to do it without impacting on safety within the racecourse. Those are the sorts of things the TRC would like a bit longer to work through and that is fine. We know we need to compensate them for the acquisition of the land and the impact on their operations. They are working through what their solutions are to the impact of the acquisition.

## **Project Budget**

- 4.16 The Committee sought some clarification on the proposed budget detailed in the submission. Of specific interest was the increase in costs for the P50 and P90 estimates:

**Mrs RYLAH** - I would like to turn to the increases in costs and I would like a refresh on P50 and P90. My question relates to the variants in the increasing costs. For P50 we have a 5.6 per cent increase but a 2.6 per cent on P90. What is the difference and why?

**Ms KING** - The P50 is our best estimate of what the project should cost. The P90 allows for some contingencies if something goes wrong. Ninety per cent of projects should come in at or under the P90 estimate. It is not a total upper limit. If everything goes completely wrong you may spend more than the P90. There is a statistical process.

As you progress from preliminary to detailed design you have more understanding and costs and risks that are managed. You know what they are so you can move them out of contingency and into known. That is why your P50 might go up a bit but your P90 doesn't necessarily go up as much because you have reduced uncertainty.

- 4.17 The Committee also questioned the witnesses on the project management costs included in the budget. The Committee's concern was that there appeared to be a duplication of costs whereby an internal resource was funded for the Department from the State Budget and then cost recovery was applied for the same internal resource from the budget allocated for capital works. Mr Paine indicated that it was not a duplication, with these resources funded from the capital works budget, without which there would be no such positions:

*Yes, but it is cost recovery for the project. ....If there wasn't any infrastructure funding made available we could significantly reduce the size of our division.*

*....I don't believe it's a duplication. There are sections of our division that are funded basically out of the capital infrastructure program. If we didn't have that level of commitment from government to roll out that capital infrastructure program we would have to scale back resources.*

## **5 DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE**

- 5.1 The following document was taken into evidence and considered by the Committee:
- Brooker Highway/Elwick Road Upgrades - Department of State Growth – Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, May 2015.

## **6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

- 6.1 The Committee does have some significant concerns regarding the overpass from Goodwood to the Goodwood Primary School. The Committee notes there are some serious safety concerns with residents crossing the Brooker Highway directly to access the school, rather than using the overpass. This dangerous situation is exacerbated for

Goodwood residents with mobility issues, those with young children in prams, the elderly and cyclists, as the current overpass, with steep stairs at either end, is not designed to facilitate access for these persons.

- 6.2 The Committee does recognise that pedestrian access and safety has been improved through the provision of pedestrian crossings at the new signalised intersection at Howard Road. However, it is the Committee's opinion that this in itself does not address the issue of connectivity between Goodwood and the school, especially for those residents using prams, bicycles, or with mobility issues.
- 6.3 While the Committee recognises that connectivity between Goodwood and the community's school does not necessarily fall within the parameters of such a project, it is satisfied that the current overpass is not fit-for-purpose and does not meet the Goodwood community's needs. The Committee therefore strongly urges the Department of State Growth to either reconsider including the redevelopment of the overpass within the current project, or give further consideration to its redevelopment in the near future as a separate project.
- 6.4 Despite these concerns, the Committee is satisfied that the need for the proposed works has been established. Once complete the works will improve the efficiency of the Brooker Highway by reducing travel times for motorists travelling on, and connecting to and from, the Brooker Highway, in addition to providing improved safety outcomes.
- 6.5 Accordingly, the Committee recommends the project, in accordance with the documentation submitted, at an estimated total cost of \$32,000,000.

**Parliament House  
Hobart  
27 May 2015**

**Adam Brooks MP  
Chairman**